App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1928.
(Jhujrai)

File No. 421-28

Serial Nos. 1 4

Later References

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 4

Part B for November 1929

SUBJECT

Appointment of Narasimhabhatta, 2nd son of Subbamma the appellant, as Girmasta Brahmin during the minority of her grandson

De 938 dated 11.11.1929 — To the Inam Comr.

The two Desai Brahmins have agreed to deposit before the Amildar to pay Rs 150/- p annum for the maintenance of the

G.R.S. 11] 1928.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Mang.)

NOTES.

File No. 4/24/1928.

FILE HEADING.

Re Conduct of Archaka duties in Sri Lakshmi Narasimha and 2 other temples at Holenarasipura

From

(1) Narasimha Murthi - Archaka Varamaddar - by his guardian & grand-mother Puttamma widow of late Archaka.

No. Petition Dated Received 29.5.29

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No.
1826			1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appeals against the M.Cs. orders declining to grant the apltts request to appoint her 2nd son Narasimha Bhatta as Sumarthia - Archaka during the minority of her grand-son Narasimha Murthi.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Petition is duly stamped. A copy of M.Cs order of 29.5.29 has been produced. The M.Cs order is dated 6.5.29 and the appeal petition was received on 29.5.29 The appeal is in time. May a report be called for. Submit for orders

A

Notes—First Sheet.

GPB—35,000—15.6.12

OFFICE OF THE MEMBER OF COUNCIL
11 JUNE 1929
No. 1674

Law Member please

Evg 10/6/29

1st Secretary

9/6. Mang 11/6/29

Serial No.

5

W/ Submit
AV
16.6.29

6 Note —
Sd/- 16/6/29

2 To The Inam Comr
No 27705/19-6-29
I do not call for report with records

3 From, Memo c. Letter no 2143 dy 8th Aug 1929.
Submits the report with records called for in Sl. 2.
The Memo under appeal against explains the facts of the case.
Alasingra Bhatta, 1st son of the dpt Puttamma (wife of Archaka Narna Bhatta) was one of the 2 Archakas of Holenarasipura temples. He himself died on 29.8.25, his Barumanu was transferred to the name of his minor son - Nara Simha Murti. During his minority, Narasimha Bhattas uncle Narasimha Bhatta was allowed to do Archaka duties in addition to Parpathegari, but as the latter's work was not satisfactory, he was not given the Archaka ship. It is reported that 2 other Archakas have been doing duties for the minor.
Against this order, Puttamma has appealed to Govt. The Memo Ground for appeal is that as

Note—Contn Sheet

Serial No.

stated by the m.c., proper arrangements have not been made for the maintenance of the minor and that while the annual income for Archaka is more than Rs 500, a paltry sum of Rs 2 & 0 is given to the minor apte whose family consists of minor apte, his guardian grand-mother and his undivided uncle with his wife & children — It is therefore prayed that the minor apte's undivided uncle Rama Simha Bhatta be appointed as the Archaka pumashta.

10 This case file be posted for hearing, if ordered, along with the next batch of cases. Submitted for orders.

A

22/8/29

W

W

24/8

The Case may be heard. It is also stated that regular enquiry has not been held about the conduct of the minor much to deprive him of the pumashtaship. The latter should naturally fall on the uncle if he is prepared to give Muchalika Some Consideration seems necessary

[illegible]

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 01684—GPB—30,000—20-4-29

Serial No.

14 Case heard on 26th October 1929.

Minor's (Appellant) grandmother Puttamma as well as Narayan Bhatta and Ramasvami Bhatta the two turn-Archaks, present.

15 Order.

The parties stated that Narasimha Bhatta who, the minor's grandmother prayed, might be appointed as the gumasta-Archak during the minority of her grandson, died some three months back and her request in this respect need not therefore be considered. The only point to be settled is her prayer for ~~the~~ a maintenance allowance ~~of~~ for the minor barawardar. Narayan Bhatta and Ramasvami Bhatta, who are the other turn Archaks, have deposed on 24th August 1928 before the Amildar that they would pay for the maintenance of the minor during his minority a sum of Rs 100 per annum. They now urge that the resources of the temples do not permit of the payment of this sum and pray that it might be reduced to Rs 120 per annum which they are prepared to pay to the minor's grandmother in two half yearly instalments of Rs 60 each. The amount agreed to be paid by Ramasvami Bhatta and Narayan Bhatta is a reasonable maintenance allowance for the minor and it should be paid by them into the Taluk Treasury on the first of July and first of January each year for payment to the minor's guardian. The first payment under this order should be made on first of January next.

/D 01684—GPB—30,000—20 1 29

Serial No. 18

Mr. under Secretary

30/10/29

19 Jan

30/10

To

The Mag Conr

No. 938 & 7/11 - 11 - 29.

Forwards a Copy of the judgement

orde

To Archak Narasimhacharlu

" Narayana Bhatta

Pattabhi

& Complaints

No 132 — 4 —

B

20/11

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—80,000—26-7-29

TWO RUPEES ೭೨-೨

2143

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
B A N G A L O R E.

Muzarai Appeal No. of 1928-29.

Appellant:- NARASIMHA MURTI,
Son of Alasingara Bhatta, Minor,
by his guardian and grand-mother
Puttamma, widow of Archak Narayana
Bhatta, Hole-Narsipur.

=====0=====

The minor Appellant begs to appeal against the order of the Muzarai Commissioner No. D, Dis. 269 of 1928-29, dated 8--5--1929, declining to appoint the minor Appellant's undivided uncle as Gumasta Archak of Sri Lakshminarasimhaswami, - Chaturbhuja Pattabhi Ramaswami and other minor Temples at Hole-Narsipur, on the following, among other

G R O U N D S:--

I. The minor Appellant's father, Alasingara Bhatta, was the Barawardar and on his death in 1925, the Baraward was made out in the name of the minor Appellant and his undivided uncle, Narasimha-bhatta was permitted to officiate as Gumasta-Archak.

II. But the minor's cousins, Narayana Bhatta and Ramaswami Bhatta, who are also Archaks doing the work in turns. engineered to blackmail the minor's

uncle with the malicious intent to deprive the minor Appellant of his livelihood by getting the work for themselves. Thus they manouevred to obtain an order by the Deputy Commissioner on 22--5--1928, to the effect that they should act as Gumastas during the minority of the Appellant, and not his undivided uncle, Narasimha Bhatta.

III. The minor Appellant humbly submits that this Archanavrithi is the sole means for the maintenance of the family consisting of the minor Appellant, his guardian grand-mother and his undivided uncle with his wife and children. In fact, there is none who is more interested in the welfare of the minor Appellant than his undivided uncle.

IV. In order to gain their nefarious object, the minor Appellant's said cousins set up some of the Dharmadarsis against his uncle who, in turn, blackmailed him before Government Officers, with the result that his uncle has been hard hit in the dark even without calling for his explanation and even without any resolution by the Dharmadarsis. The fact is that out of the 9 Dharmadarsis, the - Convener and his one friend are not on good terms, and at least 6 of the Dharmadarsis are of opinion that the minor Appellant's uncle is a fit and proper person to do Archana work.

V. It is wrongly made to appear from the Records that the minor Appellant's uncle's conduct towards the public, the Dharmadarsis and the Government - Officers is not satisfactory. The minor Appellant in this connection affirms, that this is not true. So far as the public are concerned, out of a popula

t ion

population 7000 or 8000 at Hole-Narsipur, only two or three discontented men have petitioned against the - Appellant's uncle, whose explanation was not even --- called for in the matter as it was so trivial. As regards the Dharmadarsis, as stated above, six out of 9 of them have good opinion of the Appellant's uncle and the minor Appellant respectfully submits that it is only the previous Mohamedan Amildar who has reported against him as he got wild in respect of presents to the Archak during Car Festival.

VI. No formal enquiry in these various alleged - matters of misconduct has ever been held and ~~the minor Appellant's~~ no explanation obtained. The minor Appellant's uncle was doing the Archana work for two years during the time of the minor Appellant's father, who used to go on long leave as he was conducting 'Agamas', ~~in addition to officiating on several occasions~~ and during this period he has not even been fined at any time. It is thus clear that the whole thing is one-sided and done at the instance of the cousins who have been as well been suspended for misconduct previously.

VII. When the Appeal was argued, the learned - Muzarai Commissioner orally ordered that if the minor appellant's uncle executes a Mutchalika consenting to a separate appointment being made for his Parupathey-garship, he would be appointed Gumasta Archak, until the minor Appellant attains majority, and accordingly, a Mutchalika was even executed that day alone. But unfortunately, it was probably forgotten at the time of passing the order under Appeal. It is not true that proper arrangements for the maintenance of the minor Appellant have been made. What has been actually

been

been done is that a paltry sum of Rs.2-8-0 ordered to be given to the minor-Appellant, which is not enough even for a single meal, while the annual income from the Archana work is more than Rs.500/=.

WHEREFORE the minor Appellant respectfully prays that the entire proceedings connected with the case be called for and the minor Appellant's undivided uncle, Narasimha Bhatta, be ordered to be appointed Gumasta-Archak of the temples in question for and on behalf of the minor-Appellant until he attains majority. If necessary, the resolution of the Dharmadarsis as to the fitness of otherwise of the Appellant's uncle for the wo[illegible] may be obtained.

S Krishnappa.
Advocate for the appellant

Bangalore,
27th May, 1929.



In the court of the Muzrai Commissioner
in Mysore

Appellant Puttamma widow of Archak Narayanabhatta an guardian of Narasimhamurth minor Parawardar Archak o Vishnu Temples at Hole-Narasipur

Subject Appeal (No 15/28-29) against the order of the Deputy Commissioner Hassan District declining to grant the requ of the appellant to appoint her second son Narasimhabhatta as Gumasta-Archak during the minority of her grand-son Narasimhamurth

Facts of the case

Alasingabhatta the first son of the appellant was of the three archaks of the Sri Lakshminarasimha Swami Chaturbhuja Pattabhi Ramaswamy and other minor Temple at Hole-Narasipur He died on 29-8-25 and his Parawa was transferred to the Name of his son Narasimhamurth a minor. During the minority of Narasimhamurth, Narasi Bhatta his uncle was allowed to continue as both Parpathegar and Archak till a proper Archak could be procured The oth two Archaks Ramaswami bhatta and Narayanabhatta have agreed to do Worships in place of the minor the Dharma darsi recommended this arrangement so that Narasimhabhatta may do his duties of Parpathegar properly In View of this recommendation and the fact that Narasimhabhatta do not Conduct himself as well as Archaka this arrangement was approved by the Deputy Commissioner on 22 5 28 Narasimhabhatta Sought a review of this order b having been reported that it was not desirable to

entrust this man with the archakship as there were many complaints against him he was considered to be a proper man for the archaks place, he was ill towards the public the Dharmadarsis and Government officers having been far from Satisfactory and the request to grant him the Archakship was rejected by the Deputy Commissioner on 1 10 28 The present appeal is against this order

Order No D. Dis 269 / 28-29 Dated 8-5-29

I see no reason to interfere with the decision of the Sub-ordinate officers that Narasimhabhatta should not be given the archakship it is stated that proper arrangements have been made for the maintenance of the minor it is a question whether Narasimhabhatta should not be removed from the paipattigar-ship also if he will holds that office in view of the complaints made against him the Deputy Commissioner is request to examine the matter further the appeal is rejected

Sd) P G D'Souza
Muzrai Commissioner

Copy applied for 24-1-29
copy ready 22-6-29
copy delivered 22-6-29
No words 350
copying fees 0-8-0
Comparing fees 0-2-0
Compared by.

Copy

To



ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

1928-29ನೇ ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪೋನೆಂಟ್

Vs.

ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್ ಮು॥ ರಾ॥ ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪ ನವರಿಗೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಪೈರುವರಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಿಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರೀಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ರಾಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಪೈನಲ್ಮ್ಯಾಡಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ರೀಫಂಡು ನ್ಯಾಂವು ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾವಸುಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖಚ್ಚು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ದನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ವರಿಚಯಸ್ತ
ರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾ

ತಾ. 18-5-29 ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ

S. Krishnappa

Advocate for the qn of the minor aff

UBJECT..... .....

.....

.....

Section Survey

File No. 421 - 28

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. 2770
Ex 3.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

The Dy. C. .....

Date of issue 19 - 6 - 29

Signed by Sam. E. V. G. Dyer

st of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for report with records petition no. 1824 from Narasimha murti (minor) Archak Varamaraja San by his guardian and Grand mother Puttamma appealing against your order declining to grant the appte Puttammas request to appoint her 2d San Narasimha Bhatta as Sumastha Archa during the minority

over

etc Grand-Son = Nara-Simha Murti

I have also

300) [illegible] (Dan Tutty Sechs

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER

Bangalore, 7th August 8

No. 2143 87files
28-9

P. G. D'Souza, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

SECRETARIAT.
9 AUG 1929
MUZRAI

To

P. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

D 215
4-21

SIR,

1770

With reference to your letter No. [illegible] dated [illegible] June 1929 forwarding for report with records petition from Narasimhamurthi (minor age) hereditary archaka of certain temples at Holenarasipur by his guardian and grand mother Puttamma, appealing against this office order declining to grant the appellant Puttamma's request to appoint her second son, Narasimha Bhatta as pujaka archaka during the minority of her grandson Narasimhamurthi, I have the honor to forward herewith the connected records received with the Hassan District Deputy Commissioner's letter No. Mis.643-28 dated 1st August 1929 (copy herewith enclosed). ---------
This office file No.R.Dis.152 of 26-27 dated 7th May 1927 containing the order appealed against, the preamble of which gives the facts of the case is also enclosed for reference and return.

The appeal petition together with the connected records received with your letter under reference is also herewith transmitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.M.643-28 dated 1st August 1928 from the Deputy Commissioner Hassan District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Subject.- Appeal petition of Narasimhamurthi (Mi or) Karawarda archak, re, the Gumastha Archakship of certain temples at Holenarasipur.

I have the honor to forward, herewith, 5 files of vernacular -- correspondence ending with Holenarasipur Sub Division Officer's No.Gl. 792-28 dated 26-7-1928, and two English files of this office, and to state that the facts of the case are fully contained in pages 1 to 3 of this office file No.L.Dis.F.C.7-28 dated 1-10-1928. The appeal petition and its enclosures received with your memo No.2143/28-29 dated 26-6-1928 are returned herewith.

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Huzrai Appeal No. 6 of 1929-30.

Vs.

Respondents.

Narasimhamurthi, Minor Archak Barawardar by his guardian and grand mother Puttamma.

Archaks Narayana Bhatta and Ramaswami Bhatta.

Subject.

Appeal against the Huzrai Commissioner's order rejecting the appellant's prayer to appoint her second son Narasimha Bhatta as Archak Gumasta during the minority of her grandson Narasimhamurthi, Minor Barawardar Archak, of Sri Lakshmi Narasimha Swamy and other temples of Holenarasipura

Order.

This case was heard on 26th October 1929. Minor's (Appellant) grand-mother Puttamma as well as Narayana Bhatta and Ramaswami Bhatta the two turn Archaks, present.

The parties stated that Narasimha Bhatta, who, the minor's grand-mother prayed, might be appointed as the Gumasta-Archak during the minority of her grandson, died some three months back and her request in this respect need not therefore be considered. The only point to be settled is her prayer for a maintenance allowance for the minor barawardar. Narayana Bhatta and Ramaswami Bhatta, who are the other turn Archaks, have deposed on 24th August 1928 before the Amildar that they would pay for the maintenance of the minor during his minority, a sum of Rs.150 per annum. They now urge that the resources of the temples do not permit of the payment of this sum and pray that it might be reduced to Rs. 120 per annum, which they are prepared to pay to the minor's grand-mother in two half yearly instalments of

Rs. 60/-

Rs. 60/- each. The amount agreed to be paid by Ramaswami Bhatta and Narayana Bhatta is a reasonable maintenance allowance for the minor and it should be paid by them into the Taluk Treasury on the first of July and first of January each year for payment to the minor's guardian. The first payment under this order should be made on first of January next.

Memo No. 938 Mucz 421-28-4 | Records dated, Bangalore, the 7th November 1929.

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, returning the records received with his let No. ~~Illegible~~ 2143 dated 8th August 1929.

By order,

Sd/- B. Srinivasa Iyengar,

Secretary to Government,

Financial Department.

Memo No. 939-42 mucz. 421-28-4. dated, Bangalore, the 7/11 November 1929.

Copy of the above is forwarded to ..... for information.

1) Archak Ramaswami Bhatta.
2 " Narayana Bhatta.
3 — Puttamma.
4 — Comptroller H Mu Cash

By order,

for Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

C.R.C.6.

Before the Government of His Highness the
ja of Mysore.

Inm Appeal No. 6 of 1929-30

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Varasimha murti minor Archak ramavadhar by his guardian and mother Puttamma —		Archaks Narayana Bhatta and Rama Swami Bhatta —

Subject.

Appeal against the Judge order rejecting the applt's prayer to appoint her second son Narasimha Bhatta as Archaka Gumastha during the minority of her grand-son Varasimha murti minor Varadarajaswami Archaka of Sri Lakshmi Narasimha Swamy and other temples at Holenarasipura

Under

This case was heard on 26th Oct 1929, minor's (applt) grand-mother Puttamma as well as Narayana Bhatta

GPE—500—13-8-18

Rama Swami Mudaliar
two files — Archaeology, present
[please copy in full
members under in para 15
by the Office reply dt. 30th inst
from the parties stated
Jany. next.

Memo

938 Mez 4 21-28-4.

Copy to Dr. retg. the with records.
records received with his
letter no. 2143 Dy S. S. dy. (939-42 mez. 4.
Copies to (1) Asst Archaeologist
and (2) Respts. Archaeology B. O
V. Straits & N. Straits. 30/10

Despatched on 11

O/C Jan 1 seal

Copy to Comptr
for information

30/10 B. O

AG
RG
19/11

O/C Jan. seal